



Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 3 FEBRUARY 2022
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Anne Fairweather
Tracey Graham
Christopher Hayward
Shravan Joshi
Deputy Edward Lord
Jeremy Mayhew
Deputy Tom Sleigh
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy James Thomson
Alderman Sir David Wootton
Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons

Enquiries: Polly Dunn
polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting
Members of the public can observe this public meeting at the below link:
<https://youtu.be/ezR9FFBzzBA>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

Lunch will be served in the Guildhall Club at 1pm

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 January 2022.

For Decision
(Pages 5 - 8)

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE ON PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BIDS**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Decision
(Pages 9 - 20)

5. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND - APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL**

Report of the Managing Director of the Bridge House Estate and Chief Charities Officer

For Decision
(Pages 21 - 48)

6. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Part 2 – Non-Public Agenda

9. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 January 2022.

For Decision
(Pages 49 - 50)

10. **ACTION FRAUD CONTRACT EXTENSION - CAPITAL EXPENDITURE**

Report of the Commissioner.

For Decision
(Pages 51 - 58)

11. **CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR CITY FUND PROPERTIES (ARCFP) - REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR 2022/2023**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Decision
(Pages 59 - 72)

12. **CITY FUND - REFURBISHMENT OR REPLACEMENT OF THE FORESHORE RIVER DEFENCES FRONTING RIVERBANK HOUSE, UPPER THAMES STREET, LONDON EC4**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Decision
(Pages 73 - 88)

13. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

Confidential Agenda - Circulated Separately

15. **DESTINATION CITY - STRATEGIC REVIEW INDEPENDENT REVIEW REPORT -
GROWTH BID**

Report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth.

For Decision

RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Friday, 14 January 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources)
Committee held at Informal Hybrid Meeting on Friday, 14 January 2022 at 12.30 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)	Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)	Jeremy Mayhew
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Sir Michael Snyder
Tijs Broeke	Deputy James Thomson
Christopher Hayward	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Shravan Joshi	

In Attendance

Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Gregory Moore	- Assistant Town Clerk
Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
John Cater	- Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Chamberlain
Dianne Merrifield	- Chamberlain's Department
Sonia Virdee	- Chamberlain's Department
Paul Wright	- Remembrancer's Department
Aaron Downey	- Private Secretary to the Chair of Policy & Resources

Members:

Randall Anderson
Deputy Wendy Hyde
Sophie Fernandes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Keith Bottomley.

2. MEMBER DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 17 December 2021, be approved as an accurate record.

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2022/23 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - STAGE 2 FINAL PROPOSALS**

Members considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding Capital Funding prioritisation of 2022/23 Annual Capital Bids (Stage 2 Final Proposals).

RESOLVED, that Members:

- Note the revised total value of 2022/23 bids of £45.6m (subject to final confirmation).
- Agree that the revised bids relating to three schemes detailed in paragraph 6 be rated as green, subject to final approval of the amount for the St Paul's Gyrotory revised bid.
- Confirm the proposed final RAG rating of £26.2m green, £12.6m amber and £6.8m red (detailed in the appendices).
- Agree that funding for the green bids of £26.1m be agreed in principle and incorporated into the medium-term financial plans of City Fund and City's Cash (noting that the balance of £0.1m has already been agreed by the BHE Board).
- Note that amber and red bids will be deferred with amber-rated bids to be placed on a reserve list to be progressed if savings are later identified from the provisions for green bids.
- Agree that the financial disciplines currently in place be continued, whereby
 - a) central funding will be withdrawn for schemes that slip by more than one year; and
 - b) the 'one-in, one-out' approach to funding of bids outside of the annual process be operated.
- Agree to the carry-over of the unallocated provision of £27.7m of loan facilities previously agreed for the Police and HRA.

5. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no other business.

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED, that That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

8. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2021, be approved as an accurate record.

9. **PROPOSAL FOR ADDITIONAL RESTRICTION GRANT SCHEME INCORPORATING AN OPTION TO EXTEND THE CITY RECOVERY GRANT**

Members considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding a proposal for the Additional Restriction Grant Scheme incorporating an option to extend the City Recovery Grant.

10. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 12.58 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Polly Dunn
polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Resource Allocation Sub Committee – for Decision	Date(s): 3 February 2022
Subject: Capital Funding Update on Previously Approved Bids	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	The schemes for which funding is now requested span across a range of corporate outcomes
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Yes
If so, how much?	£510k
What is the source of Funding?	£160k from City Fund Reserves and £350k from City's Cash reserves.
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Yes
Report of: The Chamberlain	For Decision
Report author: Dianne Merrifield, Group Accountant	

Summary

This report follows on from previous papers on capital prioritisation and the 2020/21 and 2021/22 rounds of annual capital bids.

Members are reminded of the two-step funding mechanism via the annual capital bid process:

- Firstly, within available funding, 'in principle' approval to the highest priority bids is sought and appropriate provisions are set aside in the annual capital and revenue budgets and the MTFPs.
- Secondly, following scrutiny via the gateway process to provide assurance of robust option appraisal, project management and value for money, RASC are asked to confirm that these schemes remain a priority for which funding should be released at this time.

The purpose of this report is two-fold - approval to the reallocation of funding between schemes to address an identified budget shortfall and to the release of funding (following gateway approvals) to allow schemes to progress.

The approved annual capital bids for 2020/21 currently total £84.4m of which £31.6m has been approved for draw-down to date. A schedule of the current 2020/21 allocations is included in Appendix 1 for information. The second annual bid round for 2021/22 granted in principle funding approval to bids with a current value of £83m of which draw-downs of £9.1m have been agreed. A schedule of the current 2021/22 allocations is included in Appendix 2 for information.

A significant increase in the cost of the Walbrook Wharf Mechanical and Electrical (M&E) Replacement scheme has been identified at Gateway 5, arising from additional fire safety requirements and higher than anticipated tender returns. This has resulted in a funding shortfall of £1.5m, of which £0.9m can be met from savings on two other schemes (applying the 'one-in, one-out' approach) as summarised in Table 1 (para. 11). The balance of funding is to be met mainly through the reallocation of government grant received for the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme, with the rest from savings in the Cyclical Works Programmes.

In addition, release of £510k to allow progression of the three schemes summarised in Table 2 (para. 12) is now proposed. Funding for these schemes can be met from the provisions set aside from the reserves of City Fund and City's Cash via the 2021/22 capital bids: £50k from CIL and £110k from capital reserves (all City Fund), plus £350k from City's Cash general reserves.

Members will recall that financial disciplines currently in place include that central project funding may be withdrawn for schemes that slip by more than one year. A review is underway and a report detailing any unallocated central funding provisions will be brought to Members for review, reflecting discussions that have been taking place at the bi-lateral meetings.

Recommendations

Resource Allocation Sub Committee Members are requested -

- (i) To agree to apply the 'one-in, one-out' approach to reallocate £909k from the savings on two other City Fund schemes to provide top-up funding towards the cost increase on the Walbrook Wharf M&E Replacement scheme, with approval to release the central funding being subject to approval of the Gateway 5 proposals (by other committees).
- (ii) To review the schemes summarised in Table 2 and, particularly in the context of the current financial climate, to confirm their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time; and accordingly
- (iii) To agree the release of up to £510k for the schemes in Table 2 from the reserves of City Fund and City's Cash as appropriate, subject to the required gateway approvals.
- (iv) To note that in order to maintain sound financial discipline a review of unallocated central project funding provisions will be brought to Members, reflecting discussions taking place at the bi-lateral meetings.

Main Report

Background

1. As part of the fundamental review, Members agreed the necessity for effective prioritisation of capital and SRP projects, with central funding allocated in a measured way. This has been achieved via the annual capital bid process which applies prioritisation criteria to ensure that corporate objectives are met, and schemes are affordable.

2. The following criteria against which capital and supplementary revenue projects are assessed have been agreed as:
 - i. Must be an essential scheme (Health and Safety or Statutory Compliance, Fully/substantially reimbursable, Major Renewal of Income Generating Asset, Spend to Save with a payback period < 5 years.)
 - ii. Must address a risk on the Corporate Risk register, or the following items that would otherwise be escalated to the corporate risk register:
 - a. Replacement of critical end of life components for core services;
 - b. Schemes required to deliver high priority policies; and
 - c. Schemes with a high reputational impact.
 - iii. Must have a sound business case, clearly demonstrating the negative impact of the scheme not going ahead, i.e. penalty costs or loss of income, where these are material.

The above criteria were used as the basis for prioritising the annual capital bids.
3. The scope of schemes subject to this prioritisation relates only to those funded from central sources, which include the On-Street Parking Reserve, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), flexible external contributions and allocations from the general reserves of City Fund, City's Cash or BHE¹. This means that projects funded from most ring-fenced funds, such as the Housing Revenue Account, Designated Sales Pools and Cyclical Works Programmes *are excluded*, as well as schemes wholly funded from external grants, and tenant/ developer contributions e.g. under S278 agreements and S106 deposits.
4. Members are reminded of the two-step funding mechanism via the annual capital bid process:
 - Firstly, 'in principle' approval to the highest priority bids within available funding is sought and appropriate provisions are set aside in the annual capital and revenue budgets and the MTFPs.
 - Secondly, following scrutiny via the gateway process to provide assurance of robust option appraisal, project management and value for money, RASC is asked to confirm that these schemes remain a priority for which funding should be released at this time.

Current Position

5. From the 2020/21 bid round, central funding of £84.4m is currently allocated for new capital bids across the three main funds. To date, £31.6m has been drawn down to allow 36 of these schemes to be progressed. A schedule of the current 2020/21 allocations is included in Appendix 1 for information.
6. Central funding of a further £83m across the three main funds for the 2021/22 new bids is currently allocated, of which drawdowns of £9.1m has been approved in respect of 13 schemes. A schedule of the 2021/22 allocations is included in Appendix 2 for information.

¹ Contributions from Bridge House Estates are limited to its share of corporate schemes such as works to the Guildhall Complex or corporate IT systems and are subject to the specific approval of the Bridge House Estates Board.

7. In addition, there a small number of ongoing schemes for which funding was allocated as part of the Fundamental Review.

Proposals

'One-in, One-Out' Reallocation of Funding

8. Members have previously agreed that requests for additional funding outside of the annual capital bid process should be met from within the existing sums set aside for new schemes on a 'one-in, one-out' basis.
9. The cost of the Walbrook Wharf M&E replacement project has increased significantly, from £2.083m at the last gateway to £3.555m at Gateway 5 (including risk) – primarily due to additional fire safety requirements and higher than anticipated tender returns. As a consequence, additional central funding of £1.472m is now required, which has been identified from a variety of sources:

	£000
Savings in other centrally funded schemes	909
PSDS government grant	*430
CWP savings	133
Total	1,472

*subject to formal approval from Salix to reallocate the grant

10. Applying the 'one-in, one-out' principle, savings of £909k against the provisions set aside for two schemes have been identified as follows:
- Central funding from City Fund reserves of £1.530m was agreed for the Walbrook Wharf Electrical Supply and Infrastructure Upgrade as part of the Fundamental Review. Tenders for completing the scheme were lower than anticipated, giving rise to a saving of £535k.
 - Central funding of £1m from City Fund reserves was agreed for the Central Criminal Court East Wing Mezzanine Cooling and Heating project as part of the 2020/21 capital bids. Tenders for completing the works were lower than anticipated, giving rise to savings of £374k.
11. In summary, reallocation of £909k of savings on two other projects towards the shortfall on the Walbrook Wharf M&E replacement project is proposed as follows, subject to the approval of the Gateway 5 proposals by the appropriate committees:

Table 1: 'One-In, One-Out' Proposals		Capital Bid Round	City Fund	City's Cash	Total
Additional Funding Required			£000	£000	£000
Walbrook Wharf M & E	Fundamental Review		909		909
Funding to be reallocated from:					
Central Criminal Court East Wing Mezzanine Heating etc	2020/21	-	374		- 374
Walbrook Wharf Electric Vehicle Charging and Supply	Fundamental Review	-	535		- 535
Net additional Funding from capital bid resources			-	-	-

Current Requests for the Release of Funding

12. There are three schemes with 'in principle' funding approved as part of the capital bids that have progressed through the gateways for which release of £510k is now requested as summarised in Table 2:

Table 2: Project Funding Requests		Next Gate-way	Capital Bid Round	City Fund	City's Cash	Total
				£000	£000	£000
Funding to progress to the next gateway						
	Guildhall Complex Refurbishment options	G3/4	2021/22	-	350	350
	Foreshore River Defence Repairs at Riverbank House	G4	2021/22	110	-	110
Full Funding for Scheme Implementation						
*	Beech Street Transformation Public Realm	G6	2021/22	50	-	50
Total Requested Release of Funding				160	350	510
*	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)					

Further details of the individual schemes are provided in Appendix 3 attached.

13. In accordance with step two of the capital funding mechanism, Members will wish to confirm that these schemes remain a priority for funding to be released at this time particularly in the context of the current financial climate.
14. The funding for these schemes can be met from the existing provisions set aside from the relevant reserves of City Fund and City's Cash as set out in Table 2.

Financial Discipline

15. Members will recall that financial disciplines currently in place allow for central project funding to be withdrawn for schemes that slip by more than one year - unless an exceptional case is agreed by the Resource Allocation Sub Committee. There is currently a significant number of schemes with either minimal or zero drawdowns against central funding allocations that were agreed as part of the capital bids process. Accordingly, a report will be prepared to identify any schemes that are not being actively progressed, reflecting discussions taking place at the bi-lateral meetings. This will ensure that any unrequired funding is available to redirect to the highest priority areas.

Conclusion

16. The purpose of this report is two-fold - approval to the reallocation of funding between schemes to address unexpected shortfalls *and* to the release of funding for projects progressing through the gateways, to allow them to progress.
17. Adopting the 'one-in, one-out' approach, the reallocation of £909k to provide additional funding to meet the shortfall on the Walbrook Wharf M&E Replacement project is requested to be met from savings on two other City Fund schemes.
18. Requests for the release of £510k to allow six schemes to progress are set out in Table 2 (refer to paragraph 12 and appendix 3).

19. The funding for these schemes can be met from the existing provisions set aside from the relevant reserves of City Fund and City's Cash as set out in Table 2, which were agreed via the 2021/22 annual capital bids: £50k from CIL and £110k from City Fund general reserves, plus £350k from City's Cash Reserves.
20. Members will recall that financial disciplines currently in place include that central project funding may be withdrawn for schemes that slip by more than one year. Therefore, a review of unallocated central funding provisions is underway which will be brought to committee for review reflecting discussions taking place at the bi-lateral meetings.

Appendices

Appendix 1– 2020/21 Approved Bids

Appendix 2 - 2021/22 Approved Bids

Appendix 3 – Requests for Release of Funding – Scheme Details

Background Papers

- Annual Capital Prioritisation Report, 12 December 2019 (Non-Public).
- Prioritisation of Remaining 2020/21 Annual Capital Bids (Deferred from December 2019 Meeting), 23 January 2020 (Non-Public)
- Re-prioritisation of 2020/21 Approved Capital Bids, 18 September 2020 (Non-Public)
- Capital Funding – Prioritisation of 2021/22 Annual Capital Bids – Stage 2 Proposals, 10 December 2020 (Public)

Dianne Merrifield

Group Accountant, Capital

Email: [dianne.merrifield @ cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:dianne.merrifield@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

Appendix 1

Approved Bids 2020/21						THIS REPORT		THIS REPORT	
Project Name	City Fund £'m	City's Cash £'m	BHE £'m	Total Funding Allocation £'m	Funding Allocation After Re- prioritisation	Release of Funding Previously agreed	Reallocation of Funding now requested	Release of Funding now requested	
Critical End of Life Replacement									
Barbican Replacement of Art Gallery Chiller	0.300	-	-	0.300	0.300	0.018	-	-	
Car Park - London Wall Joints and Waterproofing	2.000	-	-	2.000	2.000	-	-	-	
Car Park - Hampstead Heath, East Heath Car Park Resurface	-	0.415	-	0.415	0.415	0.387	-	-	
Central Criminal Court - Replacement for Heating, Cooling and Electrics for the									
East Wing Mezzanine including the sheriff's apartments.	1.000	-	-	1.000	1.000	1.000	-	0.374	-
Finsbury Circus Garden Re-instatement	2.558	-	-	2.558	2.558	2.542	-	-	
Guildhall - North and East Wing Steam Generator replacement – including Art Gallery	0.744	0.396	0.060	1.200	0.002	0.002	-	-	
Guildhall - West Wing - Space Cooling - Chiller Plant & Cooling Tower Replacement									
	1.860	0.990	0.150	3.000	4.433	0.389	-	-	
Guildhall event spaces - Audio & Visual replacement / upgrade	-	0.330	-	0.330	0.330	0.045	-	-	
Guildhall Yard - Refurbishment/ Replacement of Pavements	-	3.000	-	3.000	3.000	-	-	-	
I.T - Computer Equipment rooms (CER) Uninterrupted Power Supplies (UPS) Upgrades and Replacements	0.090	0.100	0.010	0.200	0.200	0.200	-	-	
I.T - Essential Computer (Servers) operating system refresh programme	0.068	0.075	0.008	0.151	0.095	0.095	-	-	
I.T - Personal device replacement (Laptops, Desktops and tablet/mobile device)	1.013	1.125	0.112	2.250	2.250	2.250	-	-	
I.T - Rationalisation of Financials, HR & Payroll Systems (ERP project)	2.654	2.949	0.295	5.898	6.768	0.554	-	-	
I.T - Telephony replacement ***	0.873	0.343	0.034	1.250	-	-	-	-	
LMA : Replacement of Fire Alarm, Chillers and Landlords Lighting and Power	1.397	-	-	1.397	1.397	0.145	-	-	
Oracle Property Management System Replacement	0.713	0.380	0.058	1.151	1.151	1.150	-	-	
Structural - Lindsey Street Bridge Strengthening	5.000	-	-	5.000	5.000	0.030	-	-	
Structural - Dominant House Footbridge	1.025	-	-	1.025	1.025	0.287	-	-	
Structural - West Ham Park Playground Refurbishment	-	1.279	-	1.279	1.279	0.863	-	-	
Fully or substantially reimbursable									
Barbican Turret John Wesley High Walk	0.043	-	-	0.043	0.043	0.043	-	-	
Chingford Golf Course Development Project	-	0.075	-	0.075	0.075	-	-	-	
High Profile Policy Initiative									
Bank Junction Transformation (All Change at Bank)	4.000	-	-	4.000	4.000	4.000	-	-	
Culture Mile Implementation Phase 1 incl CM experiments and Culture Mile Spine	0.580	-	-	0.580	0.580	0.580	-	-	
I.T - Smarter working for Members and Officers	0.113	0.125	0.013	0.251	0.185	0.185	-	-	
Rough Sleeping - assessment hub	1.000	-	-	1.000	1.000	0.788	-	-	
Rough Sleeping High Support Hostel - Option 3	0.500	-	-	0.500	0.500	0.500	-	-	
Secure City Programme	15.852	-	-	15.852	15.852	7.174	-	-	
Statutory Compliance/Health and Safety									
Barbican Exhibition Halls	5.000	-	-	5.000	1.549	1.548	-	-	
Barbican Podium Waterproofing, Drainage and Landscaping Works (Ben Jonson, Breton & Cromwell Highwalk) Phase 2 – 1st Priority	13.827	-	-	13.827	13.827	1.517	-	-	
Covid19 Phase 3 Transportation Response*	-	-	-	-	0.568	0.568	-	-	
City of London Primary Academy Islington (COLPAI) temporary site	-	0.300	-	0.300	0.583	0.583	-	-	
Golden Lane Lighting and Accessibility	0.500	-	-	0.500	0.500	0.500	-	-	
Guildhall - Great Hall - Internal Stonework Overhaul	-	2.000	-	2.000	2.000	1.740	-	-	
Guildhall - Installation of Public Address & Voice Alarm (PAVA) and lockdown system at the Guildhall (Security Recommendation)	0.930	0.495	0.075	1.500	1.500	0.118	-	-	
I.T - Critical Security Works agreed by the DSSC **	0.112	0.125	0.013	0.250	-	-	-	-	
I.T - GDPR and Data Protection Compliance in addition saving money in being able to share and find information quickly	0.090	0.100	0.010	0.200	0.200	-	-	-	
Confined and Dangerous Spaces - Barbican Centre	2.000	-	-	2.000	2.000	0.098	-	-	
Confined and Dangerous Spaces - GSMD	-	0.400	-	0.400	0.400	0.019	-	-	
Fire Safety - Car Park London Wall - Ventilation, electrics, lighting and fire alarm works	1.370	-	-	1.370	1.370	0.250	-	-	
Fire Safety - Works in car parks	1.032	-	-	1.032	1.032	0.699	-	-	
Fire Safety - Frobisher Crescent, Barbican Estate (compartmentation) *	0.550	-	-	0.550	1.203	1.203	-	-	
Fire Safety - Smithfield sprinkler head replacement and fire door replacement.	-	0.150	-	0.150	0.150	0.020	-	-	
Queen's Park Public Toilet Rebuild	-	0.380	-	0.380	-	-	-	-	
Spitalfields Flats Fire Door Safety	0.146	-	-	0.146	0.146	-	-	-	
Spend to save with a payback < 5 years									
Energy programme of lighting and M&E upgrade works (Phase 1)****	0.440	0.489	0.049	0.978	0.268	0.050	-	-	
I.T - GDPR Compliance Project Unstructured data	0.112	0.125	0.013	0.250	-	-	-	-	
Wanstead Flats Artificial Grass Pitches (spend to save > 5 years)	-	-	-	-	1.700	-	-	-	
The Monument Visitor Centre	-	2.500	-	2.500	-	-	-	-	
Total Approved Funding Bids	69.492	18.646	0.900	89.038	84.434	31.640	-	0.374	-

<u>Previous Funding Allocation</u>	89.038
Net reductions from previous reprioritisation exercise (September 2020)	- 4.032
* Reallocated from the 2021/22 annual bids and fundamental review schemes	- 0.653
* £0.500m of capital funding foregone in place of revenue funding solution (telephony/security)	- 0.500
*** £0.250m of capital funding foregone in place of a revenue funding solution (telephony/security)	- 0.250
****Reallocation of £0.229m to 2021/22 scheme (BEMS Phase 1)	- 0.229
****£0.246m of central funding no longer required and returned to the centre	- 0.246
	84.434

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2

Approved Bids 2021/22							
				THIS REPORT		THIS REPORT	
Project Name	City Fund £'m	City's Cash £'m	BHE £'m	Total Funding Allocation £'m	Latest Funding Allocation after Reprioritisation	Release of Funding Previously agreed	Reallocation of Funding now requested
Critical End of Life Replacement							
OSD - Tower Hill Play Area Replacement Project	0.120			0.120	0.120	0.120	
SVY - BEMS Upgrade Project-CPG Estate – Phase 1***	0.507	0.375	0.022	0.904	1.133	0.451	
SVY - Smithfield Condenser Pipework Replacement		0.564		0.564	0.564		
CHB - IT SD WAN /MPLS replacement	0.320	0.145	0.035	0.500	0.500	0.050	
CHB - IT LAN Support to Replace Freedom Contract	0.096	0.043	0.011	0.150	0.150		
CHB - Libraries IT Refresh	0.220			0.220	0.220		
BBC - Barbican Centre - Catering Block Extraction	0.400			0.400	0.400		
High Profile Policy Initiative							
DBE - Secure City Programme Year 2	4.739			4.739	4.739	1.700	
SVY - Guildhall Complex Masterplan - initial feasibility and design work		0.350		0.350	0.350		0.350
Statutory Compliance/Health and Safety							
DCCS - Fire Doors Barbican Estate*	20.000			20.000	19.597	0.275	
SVY - St Lawrence Jewry Church - Essential works (Top-Up Funding)		2.565		2.565	2.565	2.136	
SVY - Denton Pier and Pontoon Overhaul Works	1.000			1.000	1.000	0.050	
OSD - Hampstead Heath Swimming Facilities - Safety, Access and Security Improvements		0.755		0.755	0.755	0.064	
DBE - Public Realm Security Programme	1.238			1.238	1.238	0.027	
DBE - Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm project (Top-Up Bid)	0.900			0.900	0.900	0.141	0.050
MAN - Central Criminal Courts, Fire Safety and associated public address system (Top-up bid)	0.683			0.683	0.683		
MAN - Central Criminal Court Cell Area Ducting and Extract System Balancing	1.000			1.000	1.000		
SVY - Riverbank House, Swan Lane - repairs to foreshore river defence	0.500			0.500	0.500		0.110
CHB - Public Services Network replacement	0.064	0.029	0.007	0.100	0.100		
GSMD - Guildhall School - Silk Street Ventilation Heating and Cooling		2.000		2.000	2.000		
GSMD - Guildhall School - Milton Court Correction of Mechanical Systems		0.600		0.600	0.600		
GSMD - Guildhall School - John Hosier Ventilation and Temperature Control		0.700		0.700	0.700		
CHB - IT Security**	0.192	0.087	0.021	0.300	0.000		
Spend to save with a payback < 5 years							
SVY - Energy Reduction Programme – Phase 2	0.194	0.181		0.375	0.375		
Sub-Total - Bids Fulfilling the Funding Criteria excluding	32.173	8.394	0.096	40.663	40.189	5.014	0.000
Climate Action :							
DBE - Public Realm (Pedestrian Priority)	6.050			6.050	6.050	2.454	
OSD - Climate Action Strategy		2.120		2.120	2.120	0.690	
DBE - Embed climate resilience measures into Public Realm works (Cool Streets and Greening)	6.800			6.800	6.800	0.980	
SVY -Energy Efficiency / Net Zero Carbon - Investment Estate - City Fund	4.340			4.340	4.340		
SVY - Energy Efficiency / Net Zero Carbon - Investment Estate - Strategic Estate City Fund	0.000			-	-		
SVY - Climate Resilience Measures	4.000	0.000		4.000	4.000		
SVY - Climate Action Strategy Projects CPG Operational Properties	11.723	7.138	0.649	19.510	19.510		
Sub-Total - Climate Action	32.913	9.258	0.649	42.820	42.820	4.124	0.000
Total Bids Fulfilling the Funding Criteria	65.086	17.652	0.745	83.483	83.009	9.138	0.000
Previous Funding Allocation					83.483		
* £0.403m reallocated as top-up funding for the Frobisher Crescent Fire Compartmentation Project (2020/21 Bid)					-0.403		
** £0.300m of capital funding foregone in place of a revenue funding solution (telephony/security)					-0.300		
*** £0.229 reallocated from savings on Energy Reduction Programme (2020/21 bid)					0.229		
Latest Funding Allocation					83.009		

This page is intentionally left blank

Requests for Release of Funding – Scheme Details

The following provides details of the three schemes for which approval to release central funding of up to £510k is now sought, as summarised in Table 2 of the main report.

(i) **Guildhall Complex Refurbishment – release of £350k to progress the design options**

- There is a desire to create a holistic long term vision for the Guildhall Complex to address changes in working patterns, mitigate significant future maintenance obligations and achieve climate action targets through the redevelopment of the site.
- The ‘in principle’ funding of £350k from central City’s Cash reserves was agreed via the 2021/22 capital bids to provide some initial funding to consider these options, in advance of any commitment to the significant funding required for a redevelopment.
- The request is for the release of £350k to appoint a professional team to develop the City’s requirements for the future.
- A top-up bid for central funding of an additional £1.15m has been submitted as part of the 2022/23 capital bids to complete the option appraisal required to inform a decision on the way forward.

(ii) **Riverbank House Foreshore Riverbank Works - release of £110k to progress the scheme**

- This project is to undertake refurbishment or replacement works to the river defences fronting Riverbank House, a City Fund investment property.
- The works were instigated following receipt of an enforcement notice issued by the Environment Agency, requiring the City to fulfil its statutory obligations to maintain the foreshore defences as riparian owner. The ‘in principle’ central funding from City Fund reserves was agreed via the 2021/22 annual capital bids.
- This request is to draw down £110k to undertake an option appraisal to determine the works required.

(iii) **Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm– release of £50k to fund the investigation of occasional culture events on Beech Street**

- The ‘Vision for Beech Street’ was approved by Members in 2018 to bring about improvements in the area, the Phase 1 priority works to deliver urgent air quality improvements and Phase 2 to transform the covered street into a vibrant link in the Culture Mile. Funding was initially prioritised for Phase 1 air quality improvements.
- A bid for top-up funding of £900k to progress air quality improvements was agreed in principle from City Fund reserves (CIL) as part of the 2021/22 capital bid round. This included a provision of £50k to investigate ways to deliver greater activation of Beech Street and deliver outcomes of the Culture Mile ‘look and feel’ strategy in preparation for Phase 2 of the scheme.
- This request is for approval to draw down the £50k provision to fund investigation of occasional culture events on Beech Street.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee – For decision	Dated: 03/02/2022
Subject: Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund – Applications for Approval	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Managing Director of the Bridge House Estate and Chief Charities Officer	For Decision
Report author: James Lee, Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Programme Manager	

Summary

The City Corporation adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2014. National CIL Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts be reserved for neighbourhood funding. Local authorities are required to engage with communities on how this neighbourhood funding should be used to support development of the area. Local authorities are required to report annually on the collection and use of CIL funds, identifying separately the amount of funds allocated to neighbourhood funding.

An amended policy for the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) was agreed by this committee in May 2019, with agreement that a proportion of funding applications by officers under delegation, whilst retaining the role of the Committee to determine applications in excess of £50,000.

The CILNF application process is managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit, with officers assessing applications and providing support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications. The administrative cost incurred in operating the Fund is recoverable from the 5% of City CIL funds allowed to cover such costs in Regulations.

Members are asked to approve the grants recommended for their consideration at meetings of the CILNF Officer Panel in December 2021 and January 2022. Members are asked to note the grants approved and rejected under delegated authority.

Recommendation

Members are recommended to:

1. To note the approved and rejected grants under delegated authority at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in December 2021 (**Appendix 1**).
2. To approve the grant recommended to **‘Outset Contemporary Art Fund’** at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in December 2021 (**Appendix 2**).
3. To approve the grant recommended to **‘Historical Royal Palaces’** at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in December 2021 (**Appendix 2**).
4. To approve the grant recommended to **‘Pollinating London Together’** at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in January 2022 (**Appendix 2**).
5. To note the current position of the CILNF with respect to funds available and upcoming reporting.

Main Report

Background

1. Under the 2008 Planning Act and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), a local authority may adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) setting out how it will require contributions from development towards the cost of providing new infrastructure. A local authority adopting a CIL must set out the infrastructure it will fund through the CIL in a document known as a Regulation 123 List. CIL regulations allow for up to 5% of CIL receipts to be used to fund the administrative costs incurred in operating a CIL. Regulations also require that 15% of CIL receipts shall be reserved for neighbourhood funding, or 25% where there is a neighbourhood plan. Neighbourhood funding must be passed to a neighbourhood forum, parish or town council, where they exist. Where they do not exist (as in the City of London), the local authority will retain CIL neighbourhood funds but should engage with communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend this element of CIL.
2. In accordance with national Planning Practice Guidance, local authorities should set out clearly and transparently how they will engage with communities and the use of the neighbourhood fund should match the priorities expressed by these local communities.
3. Regulations require that the neighbourhood fund must be used to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area. CIL Regulation 59F allows a wider scope of projects to be funded through the CILNF than that allowed for other CIL funding, including:
 - a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; (the same criteria as for other CIL funds) or

- b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area (additional flexibility for neighbourhood fund).

In delivering against (b) above, the neighbourhood fund does not have to be spent in accordance with the local authority's CIL spending priorities (set out in its Regulation 123 List).

4. Local authorities are required to report annually on the collection and use of CIL funds, identifying separately the amount of CIL Neighbourhood Funds and how they have been used.
5. Management of the City CILNF process is aligned with the City's existing grant allocation process, through the Central Grants Unit (CGU). A full policy document can be found at Appendix 3.
6. The CGU is co-located with the City Bridge Trust (CBT) team in order to facilitate consistency of approach and harmonise service standards across grant-making activities by the City Corporation (in its various capacities, including as trustee of a number of charities which form part of the Central Grant Programme). The Managing Director of the Bridge House Estate and Chief Charities Officer is responsible for maintaining an overview of the CGU (and broader charity matters), with relevant input from the Charity Finance Team (Chamberlain's Department), with the work being delivered by the Head of Central Grants Unit.
7. Where an application will have an impact on a specific ward, your Officers will consult with Members of that ward as part of the assessment process.

Current Position

8. The City CILNF launched on 1 September 2020. In January 2022, the neighbourhood portion of the City CIL stood at £5.3 million in available funds.
9. Since the launch of the City CILNF, Members and Officers have worked together to commit £1,878,732 in funding to City communities.
10. As of 22 November 2021, the CILNF is temporarily paused to new applications in excess of £50,000 in order to carry out its statutory reporting and public consultation obligations. It is anticipated that the fund will resume acceptance of applications over £50,000 in Spring 2022.
11. The City CILNF is currently processing an application pipeline of £5,099,142. It is not anticipated that this entire pipeline will be fully funded.

Funds committed to date	Funds available	Current pipeline
£1,878,732	£5,373,849	£5,099,142

12. A public consultation on the first 18 months of the CIL is due by March 2022.

13. Across its meetings in December 2021 and January 2022, the CILNF Officer Panel considered six applications. **Appendix 2** outlines three grants which Members of the Committee are now asked to approve at this meeting in February.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

14. Corporate Plan Implications: the CILNF can resource community-led infrastructure improvements across the City and contribute towards meeting the 3 aims of the Corporate Plan 2018-23, particularly Contribute to a Flourishing Society and Shaping an Outstanding Environment.
15. Security Implications: the CILNF fulfils a statutory requirement for the spending of CIL. There are no direct security implications, though future funded projects may bring security benefits.
16. Financial Implications: the CILNF makes use of that proportion of City CIL monies which are required by statute to be used to assist in the delivery of new infrastructure to meet community needs (15% of CIL funds). The costs of management of the grant application process will be met through the 5% of CIL funds set aside by statute to cover CIL administration.
17. Equalities and resourcing implications: the CILNF has been subject to an Equality Analysis Test of Relevance. This has concluded that there are no impacts arising from these proposals for protected groups and that a full Equality Analysis is not required.
18. Volunteering programme: Projects funded by the CILNF may provide volunteering opportunities which can be offered to Officers via the Corporate Volunteering programme if and when appropriate.
19. Delivery of the Fund will be through existing staff resources in Departments. Staff resource requirements will be met through allocation of some of the City CIL funds set aside by statute to cover administration costs.

Conclusion

20. Community Infrastructure Levy legislation requires local authorities to reserve between 15% and 25% of CIL receipts for neighbourhood funding. Where there is no recognised parish or town council or neighbourhood forum, the local authority will retain the neighbourhood fund but must spend it on infrastructure which meets community needs. The local authority must consult the community on how these funds will be used.
21. The Neighbourhood Fund application process is managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit, with officers assessing applications and providing support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications. The administrative cost incurred in operating the Fund is recoverable from the 5% of

City CIL funds allowed to cover such costs in Regulations. The programme launched on 1 September 2020.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Applications Approved and Rejected under Delegated Authority

Appendix 2 – Assessment Pack

Appendix 3 – CIL Neighbourhood Fund Policy

Background Papers

Report to Policy & Resources Committee 02/05/2019: City of London Community Infrastructure Levy – Approval of Neighbourhood Fund

James Lee

Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Programme Manager

E: james.lee@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1 – Grants Approved and Rejected under Delegated Authority

Grants Approved under Delegated Authority

Royal Society for Blind Children (ref. 18949)	£48,646 towards the first year of operating costs for a state-of-the-art hub for blind children and their families, that will be located in the Square Mile.
--	--

Grants Rejected under Delegated Authority

BeBox Limited (ref. 18559)	£43,660 to create meditative experiences within the OPO app that provide wellness solutions to inspire exploration of City of London public spaces while supporting mental health.
-----------------------------------	--

This page is intentionally left blank



Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund

Assessment Pack – February 2022

James Lee & Jack Joslin

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND

Outset Contemporary Art Fund (ref. 18864)

Amount requested: £344,335

Amount recommended: £344,335

Purpose of grant request: To support a three year delivery partnership securing long-term creative infrastructure, and rapid activation using short-term projects, to achieve “Fuelling Creative Renewal” and “Culture/Commerce Taskforce” strategic aims.

Type of cost: Revenue

Ward(s) benefitting: *All wards*

The Applicant

Outset Contemporary Art Fund (Outset) was established in 2003 and is recognised as a leading international charity supporting innovative art projects. With a presence in nine countries, the charity has raised over £18 million worldwide in support of the creative ecosystem. The charity works with a range of stakeholders in the UK and has strong relationships with many cultural institutions in London, with whom they fund artistic projects.

Background and detail of proposal

The applicant is seeking funding to pay the staff and delivery costs for three years of the 'Studiomakers' project within the City. The project will deliver a number of activities to support the creative industry within the City and raise the profile of the City as a cultural hub. Outset will achieve this by using their established networks to help broker property agreements between the creative and commercial industries, with the intention of securing at least 42 free workspaces and providing mentorship to creative small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that are currently under-represented in the City.

The applicant has provided an in-depth set of delivery plans which outline how they will meet their objectives. They offer free access to a team of professionals who provide legal and financial advice to the organisations and individuals supported by Outset; they are committed to working with Corporation departments to understand the Corporation's needs as a stakeholder in this project; they will work with local businesses to enhance the City's night-time and weekend offer; they are committed to using this period of funding to secure long-term partnerships that will support artistic communities to flourish in the City.

Outset has a track record of working successfully with corporate partners and local authorities (including the City of London Corporation) to deliver the physical space and career guidance needed support the next generation of talent in the Arts. Outset have thought carefully about how this application aligns with the City's own strategic aims and how their work can help to drive footfall and commerce into the City by making it appeal to new audiences.

During the pandemic, Outset supported the Greater London Authority with work to protect the cultural sector. Outset delivered community outreach sessions and webinars that saw high levels of engagement (four times the industry average) and demand for their support, such as helping organisations broker zero-rent agreements. Outset are a trusted partner to many organisations who recognise the value of the creative and cultural sectors to London's economy. Since submitting this application, Outset have already been successful in forging a partnership with BH2, an independent real estate business, who have offered their entire portfolio across the Square Mile as potential sites for this project.

Financial Information

Like many other charitable organisations, Outset saw their income fall because of the pandemic, decreasing from £1.2m in 2019. Outset have an unorthodox reserves policy, which states: “holding reserves is considered unnecessary by the Trustees of Outset as we are consistently keeping up-to-date and monitoring our allocation of funds” they do, however, go on to add “we do not ring-fence a buffer as a reserve but are looking into formalising this for future years”. Despite the lack of policy and posting a significant loss in 2020, Outset have managed to stabilise their financial position and maintain a healthy level of free reserves. If this grant were to be approved, we would ask Outset to strongly consider formalising their reserves policy.

Outset are contributing £57,000 towards the running of this project.

Year end as at 31 August	2020	2021	2022
	Signed Accounts	Year end accounts	Budget
	£	£	£
Income & expenditure:			
Income	736,756	729,089	906,411
Expenditure	(945,635)	(806,829)	(866,001)
Surplus/(deficit)	(208,879)	(77,740)	40,410
Reserves:			
Total restricted	17,210	23,859	23,859
Total unrestricted	170,093	85,704	126,114
Total reserves	187,303	109,563	149,973
Of which: free unrestricted	166,155	88,415	128,825

Recommendation

This application would find natural synergies with other work being funded through the CILNF and support the City's cultural offer to be greater than the sum of its parts. Taken on its merit alone, this is a good project from a well-established organisation that is certain to deliver positive outcomes and enhance the City's cultural offer.

£344,335 over three years (£110,932; £114,733; £118,670) to support a three year delivery partnership securing long-term creative infrastructure, and rapid activation using short-term projects, to achieve “Fuelling Creative Renewal” and “Culture/Commerce Taskforce” strategic aims.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND

Historical Royal Palaces (ref. 18896)

Amount requested: £590,000

Amount recommended: £590,000

Purpose of grant request: Celebrate The Queen's Platinum Jubilee and create a garden attraction for the City by providing access infrastructure to the Tower of London moat.

Type of cost: Capital

Ward(s) benefitting: *All wards*

The Applicant

Historic Royal Palaces (HRP) was established in 1998 as a Royal Charter Body and is a registered charity. It is responsible for the care, conservation, and presentation to the public of the unoccupied royal palaces: HM Tower of London, Hampton Court Palace, Kensington Palace State Apartments, the Banqueting House at Whitehall and Kew Palace with the Royal Kitchens, Queen Charlotte's Cottage, and the Great Pagoda. These palaces are owned by HM The Queen in right of Crown. HRP is contracted by the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media, and Sport to manage the five London palaces on his behalf and the contract is re-authorised until 31 March 2028. HRP is also contracted by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland to manage Hillsborough Castle and Gardens in Northern Ireland.

HRP is a Public Corporation but receives no public funding, all costs are met by self-generated income. It is governed by a Board of Trustees, all of whom are nonexecutive. Historic Royal Palaces Enterprises Limited is a company wholly owned by Historic Royal Palaces. It forms the charity's general trading arm, responsible for running the commercial activities such as retail, functions, sponsorship, and other events at HRP. It gift aids its taxable profits to the Charity.

Background and detail of proposal

HRP is planning a stunning display of flowers in the Tower of London moat to celebrate Her Majesty the Queen's Platinum Jubilee. In spring 2022, over 20 million seeds will be sown in the moat from carefully designed seed mixes. From June to September, the flower display will erupt into new colours and patterns creating a dramatic and engaging experience. Designed to attract pollinators, 'Superbloom' will bring a spectacular natural beauty to the urban space and introduce a new biodiverse habitat for wildlife. Visitors can wander along a weaving path into the centre of the flowers. Specially commissioned sound installation and sculptural elements will also be added to enhance the experience.

This application seeks capital funding for the hard-landscaping and infrastructure that will enable the Jubilee 'Superbloom' celebration. The permanent infrastructure will then allow public access to the Tower moat for visitors in future years to enjoy a

new landscaped garden in Tower of London Moat. The particular elements for which HRP is seeking CILNF support are:

- A) Access to the moat garden: construction of a new entry ramp in the southwest corner of the Tower to provide step-free access to the moat.
- B) Access to the moat garden: installation of hardwearing, accessible resin-bonded pathways throughout the moat
- C) Enabling the moat garden: removal of redundant outbuilding and diesel tank
- D) Enabling the moat garden: installing a French drains to the new path network

The scheme has been designed by Historic Royal Palaces, working with landscape architects Grant Associates and University of Sheffield Professor of Planting Design, Nigel Dunnett – both of whom have extensive expertise in urban horticulture and landscape design. When the 'Superbloom' display ends in September 2022, the new natural landscape created to support it will remain in the moat as a permanent Jubilee legacy. The project will have a positive impact on the environment. Around 95% of the plants to be used are classed as 'native' or near native by the RHS and they will be highly beneficial to pollinating insects. Engineered soil (made of sand and green waste) will be used, and the seeds will be grown specifically for this project. Superbloom will be free to view from Tower Hill and tickets to enter the moat will be available for around £12.00, 3million visitors are anticipated.

This project will support the five-year vision for a vibrant and thriving City, a diverse and sustainable London and a globally successful UK outlined in CoL's Future City Report. Superbloom will be an unmissable spectacle, drawing tourism and leisure visitors back to the City to spend time and money with leisure and hospitality businesses. The biodiversity and wellbeing benefits of Superbloom will be continued by the permanent moat garden. This will be a publicly accessible green space in which to walk, collaborate and relax, helping to make the City a more attractive place for living and working. There will be a special ticket price of £1 to the Tower of London and the Superbloom for City of London and Tower Hamlet residents.

HRP has a proven track record of delivering similar projects. In 2014 the project 'Blood swept fields and seas of red' filled the moat with 888,246 ceramic poppies in a mass participation and engagement event to commemorate the centenary of the start of the First World War and seen by 5million people. 'Beyond the Deepening Shadow' in 2018 marked the 100th anniversary of the Armistice and filled the moat with 10,000 flames for 11 evenings. Both moat displays were made possible by an effective large-scale volunteering programme.

To deliver the event safely HRP is working with the relevant statutory and local Authorities and stakeholders which include Historic England, City of London Corporation, particularly the Highways department and Tower Bridge management; Tower Hamlets Council; St Katharine's Docks management; City of London Police and the Metropolitan Police; London Ambulance Service, London Fire Service; Transport for London. HRP are also working with a specialist crowd management consultancy to create a robust and resilient crowd management plan and tickets will be timed.

Ensuring Superbloom offers an experience inclusive to all is a key aim for HRP. Steps we will take include BSL and sensory tours throughout the run of the

Superbloom and quiet slots for visitors who require this. Seating will be provided in the moat, on Tower Hill and on the Wharf. The lighting design includes path edge lighting and path edges and falls have been designed to be friendly to Blind and visually impaired visitors. The path is well-designed for wheelchair access. HRP's learning programme will empower 350 school communities from across London and the UK to come together to create a new garden to celebrate the Jubilee and to improve the biodiversity of their school environment. Through collaboration with partner community groups in the City, Tower Hamlets and other neighbouring boroughs HRP will deliver outreach and volunteering programmes.

HRP have consulted widely in developing its plans, including with the Royal Household, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, livery companies, Tower Bridge and the Department for Digital, Culture Media and Sport. Its plans for the Jubilee will complement the Government and Royal Household-led celebrations and those planned by the major livery companies. The pan-livery Pollinate London Together initiative welcomes HRP proposals for biodiversity.

Financial Information

Due to the sudden and devastating impact of COVID-19, Trustees agreed at the end of 2019/20 to transfer all designated funds to free reserves to meet operating commitments over 2020/21. As uncertainties remain over the coming months, the same approach has been adopted for this financial year. Target levels of reserves will be reviewed by Trustees in 2021/22, pre covid they were £5m. The forecast for 21/22 shows losses of £25.5m and the budget for 22/23 anticipates losses of £12.5m. These losses result from substantially reduced income because of the pandemic's effect on tourism. HRP had hoped that 21/22 would be a year of full recovery with a greater return to international tourism in 22/23 but it is now more cautious as various new strains are developing. HRP will be maintaining and increasing its marketing and focus on domestic and near domestic markets.

In March 2021 HRP received a Culture Recovery Fund repayable loan of £40m from the DCMS, administered by Arts Council England. This loan will support it in covering its losses in 21/22 and 22/23 and enables it to allocate funds for investment in revenue generating projects across all palaces. This gives good reassurance over the very large forecasted unrestricted reserves deficit as it is a government back loan with generous repayment terms. Both the interest and capital have a 4 year payment holiday from March 2021, so HRP are accruing the interest payments on the CRF loan at £800k per annum and will start repayments in December 2024. Whilst there are very large free reserves deficits anticipated for 2021/22 and 2022/23 the impact on cashflow is manageable because of the substantial loan which means they can make payments as they fall due even whilst incurring losses. Your Officer is confident that the financial position would be acceptable for the duration of this grant which is 8-12 months only.

The last 18 months have been very challenging for HRP, as they have been for many organisations reliant on tourism. HRP has re-structured the group to allow for more efficient use of resources and sharing of duties. This has meant significant redundancies. It should be noted that all previous moat installations have depended on significant volunteer involvement and the use of volunteers for Superbloom is not related to the redundancy programme. The charity has a wholly owned trading

subsidiary Historic Royal Palaces Enterprises Ltd (HRPE), whose principle activities are retail, functions, and events. HPRE has experienced the same impact as HRP from the closure of the palaces and similar measures have been implemented to cut expenditure and it has renewed the overdraft facility with its bank for one year. The Independent Auditor review for the Accounts YE2021 does not identify any material concerns that affect HRP as a going concern for the next 12 months from the signing of the accounts, until October 2022. The Directors do acknowledge though that there remains uncertainty for HRPE Ltd that may cast significant doubt on that entity's ability to continue as a going concern.

The charity is hoping that the Superbloom Jubilee celebration at the Tower will be a key to its recovery. The balance of the overall project costs which total £5.5m will be funded through a mixture of grants, donations, sponsorship, ticket sales and commercial revenue. £1M of the £2m pre-opening fundraising target has been raised thorough grants and sponsorship. Whilst Officers note significant issues with the ongoing financial health of the organisation, in the short term (over which this grant will be funding the charity) we have received adequate assurances that there are sufficient plans and resources in place to deliver the project.

Year end as at 31 March	2021	2022	2023
	Signed Accounts	Forecast	Budget
	£	£	£
Income & expenditure:			
Income	32,695,000	41,402,000	61,484,000
Expenditure	(53,552,000)	(66,998,873)	(73,943,000)
Gains/(losses)	890,000	0	0
Surplus/(deficit)	(19,967,000)	(25,596,873)	(12,459,000)
Reserves:			
Total restricted	7,417,000	17,723,000	19,162,000
Total unrestricted	33,450,000	(2,452,873)	(16,350,873)
Total reserves	40,867,000	15,270,127	2,811,127
Of which: free unrestricted	5,163,000	(30,739,873)	(44,637,873)
Reserves policy target	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Free reserves over/(under) target	163,000	(35,739,873)	(49,637,873)

Recommendation

As a flagship project at a global landmark in the London, just on the boundary of the City and adjacent to Tower Bridge. This project will bring people from across London and the UK together in celebrating the Platinum Jubilee, whether as visitors or as part of outreach and learning programmes (with schools and community partner organisations) or volunteering opportunities. It will have impact that reaches across London and beyond. The permanent moat garden, with a planned mix of traditional English habitats, will have an enduring legacy providing additional green space for London and provide a sustainable income stream for HRP.

£590,000 over one year for the hard-landscaping and infrastructure that will enable the Platinum Jubilee 'Superbloom' celebration. The permanent infrastructure will then allow access to the Tower moat for visitors (significantly discounted for City and Tower hamlets residents) in future years to enjoy a new landscaped garden in the heart of London.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND (CILNF)

**Pollinating London Together (an initiative of the
Wax Chandlers' Charitable Trust) (ref. 18909)**

Amount requested: £230,000

Amount recommended: £230,000

Purpose of grant request: The appointment of a full-time ecologist and project manager, administration support, operational expenses and planting audits and pollinator nesting boxes

Type of cost: Mixture of revenue & capital

Ward(s) benefitting: *All wards*

The Applicant

Pollinating London Together (PLT) is an ecological initiative officially launched in September 2021 after being active for more than a year. It aims to create spaces in central London where all the natural pollinators can thrive, and their habitats can be enjoyed by everyone by making it more pollinator-friendly, through raising awareness of the role of pollinators and ways to protect them, and by gathering evidence and monitoring biodiversity.

A pan-livery collaboration originally initiated by the Worshipful Companies of Wax Chandlers and Gardeners, PLT has since also been joined by Grocers, Information Technologists and Farmers. It has several working groups, each chaired by a different livery to best utilise their respective links and expertise. The project is managed by its own Board but governed by the Wax Chandlers' Charitable Trust (WCCT), the Trustee of which and part-funder is the Worshipful Company of Wax Chandlers. Any monies raised by PLT are held by WCCT (this would also apply to any funding awarded under the CILNF) and treated as restricted funding, with PLT reporting to WCCT on a quarterly basis.

Background and detail of proposal

Acknowledging the vital role of pollinators in both urban and natural environments and referring to the UK National Pollinator strategy calling for '*more, bigger, better, joined up, diverse and high-quality flower rich habitats (including nesting places and shelter)*', in the summers of 2020 and 2021, PLT volunteers, most of whom are members of the livery groups signed up to the initiative, carried out plant audits of 12 green spaces in the City, such as churchyards and City gardens. The audits have helped PLT produce a list of recommended pollinator-friendly flora suitable for the Square Mile's needs and different seasons, which is shared with the keepers of the spaces, along with advice and support. The initiative has launched a website, produced informative videos, and is encouraging the use of pollinator nesting and reproduction boxes, focusing on native species of bee rather than the ubiquitous honeybee. A major part of PLT's work is to aid in the development of biodiversity corridors throughout the City, linking to surrounding boroughs; certain pollinator

species can only travel for a limited time before they need to locate a suitable plant to refuel.

On top of having had input in the City of London's (CoL) Biodiversity Action Plan, PLT is consulting the CoL Biodiversity Officer to be part of a coordinated effort to increase biodiversity in the Square Mile. Using citizen science (help of volunteers in collecting data), PLT feeds into existing databases and plans to monitor the impact of its activities in the future years. Kew Gardens has helped it establish the framework for citizen science and had visited spaces audited by PLT.

The links PLT has been able to make so far include the following groups: *Friends of City Gardens, City of London Open Spaces, Bumblebee Conservation Trust, Butterfly Conservation Trust, Greater London Authority's Head of Green Infrastructure, Golden Leaf of London, Bristol University's Urban Pollinator Research, and City Livery Action Group*. Additionally, the initiative's members have further connections with other relevant Environmental Sciences and Horticulture organisations, both domestic and international. PLT also wishes to connect and work with London Wildlife Trust and the B-line project among others. The initiative has received praise from the former Lord Mayor William Russell and the Environment Minister Rebecca Pow.

PLT is seeking £230,000 from the CILNF over two years to build on the work of its volunteers and a part-time Project Coordinator. The bulk (£65,000 p.a.) of this funding is budgeted towards salary and on-costs of a new post of an Ecologist/Project Manager, reporting to PLT's Chair and Deputy Chair. Having experience of leading major projects and the relevant academic knowledge, this post will create new partnerships for PLT and foster existing ones. It will also be instrumental in creating a 'green map' of the City and helping to establish its first biodiversity corridor. £15,000 per year is earmarked for administrative support. PLT budgets to spend £25,000 each year on project overheads, such as outreach events, media and communications, IT, accounting, and travel. The remainder of the requested amount (£20,000 over two years) is to be spent on audits of green spaces and bee nesting boxes. As of December 2021, this grant request, should it be successful, would constitute approximately two thirds of PLT's budget, excluding in-kind support from the initiative's partners.

In its 2022 business plan, PLT aims to expand its green spaces audits and encourage pollinator-friendly planting whilst increasing its membership base. PLT also hopes to collaborate with the Historic Royal Palaces Magnificent Super Bloom concept for Her Majesty's Platinum Jubilee. It also wishes to utilise Livery Schools in the planting of trees. It has expressed the possibility of working with space management and recreational management companies, and with the Chartered Architects and Building Surveyors to educate about the benefits of changing planting activities to increase diversity and pollinating. The applicant has expressed interest in the CoL's LEAP volunteering programme.

Financial Information

As at September 2021, WCCT has received £73,198 in restricted income in relation to PLT. The financial assessment has been carried out for WCCT, where PLT's income and expenditure are accounted for as one of its restricted funds. WCCT does

not have budgets due to the nature of its activities and instead implements other finance monitoring controls. The Trust is in a very healthy financial position, and your officer has no concerns regarding its viability throughout the grant period. The Trust's reserves target has been set to cover its charitable giving. The organisation has considerable free reserves and expendable endowment; although free reserves are above target, this specific project relates to the charity's PLT restricted fund and high reserves indicate an ongoing ability to provide donations as required.

Year end as at 31 March	2020	2021
	Signed Accounts	Signed Accounts
	£	£
Income & expenditure:		
Income	50,064	74,970
Expenditure	(37,593)	(49,483)
Gains/(losses)	(14,832)	120,403
Surplus/(deficit)	(2,361)	145,890
Reserves:		
Total endowed (expendable)	562,019	641,209
Total restricted	0	31,336
Total unrestricted	256,846	292,210
Total reserves	818,865	964,755
Of which: free unrestricted	256,846	292,210
Reserves policy target	19,089	19,582
Free reserves over/(under) target	237,757	272,628

Recommendation

This pan-livery initiative chimes well with the CoL's Biodiversity Action Plan. PLT's Board comprises people with relevant experience in the fields of horticulture and environmental sciences, and with the support of the associated liveries, it will likely have a lasting and positive impact on the City's biodiversity whilst engaging people with the Square Mile's green spaces. The network of affiliated organisations PLT has been able to link up with also makes a case for this collaboration to be successful, and the need for a full-time Ecologist-Project Manager to progress PLT's aims to the next stage has been demonstrated. Supporting this initiative by the CILNF will offset some of the damaging effects of the City's built environment on wildlife.

Recommended for funding as follows:

£230,000 over two years (£112,500; £117,500) towards the post of a full-time Ecologist/Project Manager, administrative support, and related project costs.

City of London

Community Infrastructure Levy

Neighbourhood Fund



City of London Community Infrastructure Levy

Neighbourhood Fund

Introduction and legislative background

1. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a charge levied on new development, introduced by the Planning Act 2008. It is intended to help local authorities deliver the infrastructure needed to support development. The power to set a charge came into effect from April 2010, through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, which have subsequently been amended.
2. The City of London Corporation implemented a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the City of London from 1 July 2014.
3. Further information on the City CIL is available on the City Corporation's website at: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>

CIL Neighbourhood Fund Requirements

4. Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts should be reserved to enable the delivery of neighbourhood priorities. These receipts should be passed directly to existing parish and town councils where development has taken place. Where a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made 25% of CIL receipts from development in the plan area is reserved for the delivery of neighbourhood priorities.
5. Where there is no existing parish, town or community council, neighbourhood plan or development order, then the local authority will retain neighbourhood CIL funds, but should engage with communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood CIL.
6. Within the City of London, there are no existing parish, town or community councils and no adopted neighbourhood plans or neighbourhood development orders. The City Corporation therefore retains the CIL Neighbourhood Fund and should seek community views on how this Fund should be used. In exercising this role, the City Corporation has considered whether specific communities or

neighbourhoods should be identified. However, given that the City is little over one square mile in area, the City Corporation considers that it should be regarded as a single neighbourhood for the purposes of collection and spending of CIL Neighbourhood Funds.

What can CIL Neighbourhood Funds be used for?

7. CIL Regulation 59(F) requires that the Neighbourhood Fund be used to support the development of the neighbourhood. The scope of projects that can be funded by the Neighbourhood Fund is wider than that for general CIL funds and comprises:
 - a. The provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
 - b. Anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.
8. This definition is deliberately wide and allows the City Corporation to work collaboratively with local communities to determine priorities and how the Fund should be used.

Scale of the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund

9. The City of London CIL was implemented from 1 July 2014.
10. At March 2019, the total amount of CIL monies received and allocated to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund was £4.5 million.

Community Priorities

11. The City Corporation has adopted a Regulation 123 List which identifies the types of infrastructure that it will consider funding using the Community Infrastructure Levy. This Regulation 123 List is kept under review and any proposals for change will be subject to public consultation. The current Regulation 123 List is available on the City Corporation's website at:
<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx> . The Regulation 123 List is used principally to guide the use of CIL monies outside of the Neighbourhood Fund.
12. In considering how to use the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, Planning Practice Guidance states that where there is no parish, town or community

council, charging authorities should engage with communities where development has taken place on their priorities for funding.

13. The City Corporation consulted on priorities for the use of the City's CIL Neighbourhood Fund during December 2018 and January 2019. This consultation revealed support for the Fund to be used primarily to deliver infrastructure which meets local community identified needs.
14. The City's Neighbourhood Fund has been established to be applied to funding applications from local communities and community groups and to deliver improvements in infrastructure which have the potential to deliver benefit to City residents, workers and visitors. The Fund could be used for:
 - Smaller scale projects, deliverable for under £50,000, in response to locally identified needs.
 - Larger projects of over £50,000 and normally less than 15% of the total available Neighbourhood Fund.

Community Definition

15. The City of London has a resident population of approximately 8,000 and a daily working population of over 500,000 occupying nearly 9 million square metres of office floorspace. The City Corporation's Statement of Community Involvement already recognises that it is not appropriate to regard the 'local community' as just the resident community. For the purposes of the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, 'community' is defined as local residents, City workers and the owners and occupiers of City buildings.

Governance Process

16. The City CIL Neighbourhood Fund will be allocated following consideration of valid applications (i.e. those that meet the adopted assessment criteria for the Neighbourhood Fund) from communities within the City of London or close to the City of London where projects support the development of the City. The determination of these applications will rest with the City Corporation. The City Corporation will publish details of funding applications and its determination of those applications on the City Corporation's website.
17. The City Corporation will prepare an annual report for the CIL Neighbourhood Fund as a separate item within the wider annual CIL

and s106 monitoring report. The Neighbourhood Fund monitoring will include details of:

- Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund receipts for the reporting year;
- Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund expenditure for the reporting year;
- Details of CIL Neighbourhood Fund expenditure for the reporting year, including the amount spent on each individual project;
- Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund monies remaining.

18. City Communities will be consulted on an annual basis on community priorities for the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund. A full review of the Neighbourhood Fund, including priorities and governance, will be undertaken at least every 5 years.

Neighbourhood Fund Application Process

19. The application process will be managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit. Information about the Neighbourhood Fund and how to apply will be posted on the City Corporation's website at: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>

20. Fund applications can be made at any time and should be submitted via an online application form which will be posted on the City Corporation's website.

Organisations eligible to bid for funding

21. Neighbourhood Fund applications will be accepted from the following types of organisation:

- Constituted voluntary organisations and resident associations
- Constituted business organisations and associations
- Registered charities
- Registered community interest companies
- Charitable companies (incorporated as not for profit)
- Registered charitable incorporated organisations
- Exempt or excepted charities

- Registered charitable industrial and provident society or charitable cooperative.
22. Applications should be from City-based organisations or should demonstrate City-based support. Applications cannot be accepted from individuals. Individuals who wish to apply for funding should do so through a City-based constituted organisation or group falling into the above definition. Applications will not be accepted from political parties or organisations involved in political lobbying.
23. Applications from City Corporation service departments will be accepted where they:
- Have the support of a City-based community group, or
 - Can demonstrate that delivery will meet community priorities, either through consultation with communities, or through an adopted City Corporation strategy which can demonstrate community support.
24. Applications for infrastructure funding to mitigate the direct impacts of development will not be accepted. Such mitigation should be delivered as part of the development process and funded through s106 Planning Obligations.

Assistance with Applications

25. The Central Grants Unit can provide assistance to applicants with the completion of application forms. Contact details are available on the City Corporation's website. The Central Grants Unit cannot provide assistance with project management or delivery of schemes funded through the Neighbourhood Fund.

Assessment Criteria

26. Applications should demonstrate that funding will be used to meet the Regulatory requirements for CIL funding set out in Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, namely to support the development of the area by:
- a. the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
 - b. anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.

27. Infrastructure improvements funded through the Neighbourhood Fund should deliver improvements necessary to support development of the City. Normally, such funding will deliver new infrastructure, but funding will also be available to meet reasonable on-going maintenance costs. Applications should, therefore, identify and include an allowance for future maintenance of any infrastructure to be provided.
28. CIL Regulations allow greater flexibility in the use of the Neighbourhood Fund compared with other CIL expenditure. Neighbourhood Funds may therefore be used to fund revenue expenditure. To avoid creating long term commitments on the Neighbourhood Fund, any requests for revenue funding should be clearly justified, showing demonstrable community benefit, and time limited to a maximum of 5 years. The City Corporation will not commit to providing CIL funding beyond the agreed time period and will need to be satisfied that alternative funding is in place if the proposed project is intended to continue beyond 5 years.
29. For larger projects of over £50,000 and up to 15% of the total value of the Neighbourhood Fund at the time of application, applications should also consider whether the project meets the priorities identified in the City Corporation's Regulation 123 List and projects identified in City Corporation strategies that have been subject to public consultation. Funding decisions will not be made solely on the basis of compliance, or otherwise, with the Regulation 123 List.
30. Applications should include evidence of the feasibility, deliverability and sustainability of the project.
31. Where possible, the application should be supported by a delivery plan or business plan, which sets out the timescales for delivery, that any necessary consents have been obtained and the mechanisms in place to ensure that the funds are used appropriately.
32. Projects should be delivered within a 12 month period from the grant of funding unless an alternative timescale has been agreed. If delivery over a longer timescale is anticipated, this should be set out clearly in the application and a justification provided for the extended timescale. The City Corporation will monitor delivery of projects, including taking action to ensure that projects are delivered on time, or seek to recover funds if projects do not proceed within agreed parameters.
33. Applications for funding in excess of £50,000 should demonstrate how the project will deliver value for money, including through the identification of any contributory or match funding. This can include contributions in time or expertise, for example, where a local community

delivers infrastructure improvements themselves, but is not necessary for a successful bid.

34. Applications to fund projects which are already in receipt of other City CIL funding, or s106, s278 funding for site specific mitigation will not normally be accepted.
35. Developers may wish to support an application from a constituted City-based organisation or group, as set out above, where the proposed infrastructure cannot be delivered through other means.

Value of Bids

36. The minimum value for applications for infrastructure funding is £1,000.
37. Individual applications should normally not exceed 15% of the total value of the available CIL Neighbourhood Fund at the time of application. Information on the available funds will be published on the City Corporation's website on a quarterly basis to inform applications.
38. Applications in excess of 15% will only be considered in exceptional circumstances, where there is demonstrable benefit to more than one of the City's communities and where the proposal aligns with other City Corporation ambitions, set out in published strategies.

Awards Process

39. The determination of applications will be made through a combination of officer delegation and Committee approval, depending on the financial value of the application. The adopted thresholds accord with those used by the City Bridge Trust in its consideration of grant applications.
40. Funding applications for under £25,000 will be determined by City Corporation officers under delegated authority. Decisions should normally be made within 12 weeks of the receipt of a valid application.
41. Applications for between £25,000 and £50,000 will be determined by a City Corporation officers under delegated authority and in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee. Decisions should normally be made within 16 weeks of the receipt of a valid application.
42. Decisions taken under delegated authority will be reported to the Resource Allocations Sub-Committee.

43. Applications for over £50,000 will be considered by the City Corporation's Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, normally on a quarterly basis. Applications will be considered as items in the public part of the meeting agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank